



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/090,256	03/01/2002	Robert E. Eccles	X-1082 US	4114
24309	7590	10/31/2005	EXAMINER	
XILINX, INC ATTN: LEGAL DEPARTMENT 2100 LOGIC DR SAN JOSE, CA 95124			TAT, BINH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2825	

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/090,256

Applicant(s)

ECCLES ET AL.

Examiner

Binh C. Tat

Art Unit

2825

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 August 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 25-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 25-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 March 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a response to the response filed on 08/18/05. The applicant argument regarding Richardson et al. are not persuasive; therefore, all the rejections based on Richardson et al. are retained and repeated for the following reasons.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1-20, and 25-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richardson et al. (US Patent 6606735).

3. As to claims 1, 10, and 25 Richardson et al. teach a method for generating a rule-based file, comprising: obtaining a rule document (see fig 1, element 111); generating a table file from the rule document (col. 7 lines 22-23, fig 4 element 403); obtaining a parameterized rule file (see fig 1 element 122 or 150); and mapping values associated with rules in the table (see fig 4A element 404) file to matching rules in the parameterized rule file (see fig 1, fig 2 col 4 lines 10 to col. 6 lines 15 and col 15 line 58 to col 16 lines 6; Especially col 4. lines 27-39 and col 5. lines 37-51 and col 15 line 58 to col 16 lines 6).

4. As to claims 2 Richardson et al. teach wherein the parameterized rule file is selected from a design rule document, a layout versus schematic document, an extraction technology document, and a technology file (see fig 1 element 122 or 150).

Art Unit: 2825

5. As to claims 3, Richardson et al. teach wherein the rule document is a first design rule document, and wherein the parameterized rule file is a parameterized design rule check file (see fig 1, element 111, 122 or 150; col. 4 lines 54-56).

6. As to claims 4, 11, and 26, Richardson et al. teach wherein the step of generating a table file comprises: converting the first design rule document into a text file (see fig 3a-3b col 6 line 24 to col 7 lines 14); checking for a rule indicator in the text file; and replacing information adjacent to the rule indicator with a design rule value for a design rule found with the rule indicator (see fig 3a-3b col 6 line 24 to col 7 lines 14).

7. As to claims 5, 12, and 27, Richardson et al. teach wherein the step of mapping comprises: comparing the parameterized design rule check file with design rules from the table file (see fig 3a-3b col 6 line 24 to col 7 lines 14); and replacing the design rules found in the parameterized design rule check file with respective design rule values from the table file, the design rule values associated with the design rules (see fig 1-3 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14).

8. As to claims 6, and 13, Richardson et al. teach wherein the step of replacing information comprises selecting the information from a first type of information (see col 5 to col 7).

9. As to claims 7, 14, and 28, Richardson et al. teach further comprising: storing the design rule check file (see fig 1-3 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14); checking for a second type of information; and repeating the step of mapping using the second type of information to provide another design rule check file (see fig 1-4 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14 and col 9 lines 49 to col 12 lines 58).

Art Unit: 2825

**10.** As to claims 8, and 17, Richardson et al. teach further comprising: checking for a second design rule document (see fig 1-3 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14); repeating the step of generating using the second design rule document to provide another design rule check file (see fig 1-4 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14 and col 9 lines 49 to col 12 lines 58).

**11.** As to claims 9, and 18, Richardson et al. teach wherein the second design rule document is for scaling to accommodate lithography (see fig 1-3 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14).

**12.** As to claims 15, Richardson et al. teach wherein the first rule document is a spreadsheet (see fig 1-3 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14).

**13.** As to claims 16, Richardson et al. teach wherein the first type of information and the second type of information correspond to different columns of the rule values in the spreadsheet (see fig 1-3 col 5 to col 7).

**14.** As to claims 19, Richardson et al. teach wherein the second rule document is a second design rule document for a second minimum dimension lithography different from the first minimum dimension lithography (see fig 1-4 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14 and col 9 lines 49 to col 12 lines 58).

**15.** As to claims 20, Richardson et al. teach wherein the first minimum dimension lithography is for an embedded core, and the second minimum dimension lithography is for a host integrated circuit device comprising the embedded core (see fig 1-4 col 4 line 10-40 and col 5 lines 36 to col 6 lines 14 and col 9 lines 49 to col 12 lines 58).

### Remarks

Applicant's response and remarks filed on 08/18/05 have been carefully review.

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Key argument and their response related to the claims are listed as below:

Applicant contends that Richardson et al. do not describe "mapping values associated with rules in the table file to matching rules in the parameterized rule file" probes as claimed. In response to Applicant's argument that Richardson et al. do not describe "mapping values associated with rules in the table file to matching rules in the parameterized rule file" probes as claimed, Examiner respectfully disagrees. The prior art (Richardson et al. U. S. 6606735) do teach mapping the value of tolerances that associated with the rules (see fig 1, fig 2 col 4 lines 10 to col. 5 lines 51; Especially col 4. lines 27-39) that is Richardson et al disclose value-to-rule mechanism and Richardson et al disclose "mapping values associated with rules in the table file (see fig 4a element 404) to matching rules in the parameterized rule file" (see fig 1, fig 2 col 4 lines 10 to col. 6 lines 15 and col 15 line 58 to col 16 lines 6; Especially col 4. lines 27-39 and col 5. lines 37-51 and col 15 line 58 to col 16 lines 6). (applicant only said the values associated with rules **not rule values** like what applicant said on remark). For this reason, examiner holds the rejection proper.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO**

Art Unit: 2825

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh C. Tat whose telephone number is (571) 272-1908. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 - 4:00 (M-F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mathew Smith can be reached on (571) 272-1907. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Binh Tat  
Art Unit 2825  
October 27, 2005

*U. Huendo*  
THUAN DO  
Primary examiner  
10/28/2005